

## **REMARKS**

### **Summary of Office Action**

Claims 1-4, 6, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18 and 19 stand rejected under §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Lee et al. (US 6,295,105).

Claims 5, 10, and 17 stand rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of Shiotani et al. (JP 2001-338512).

Claims 7 and 13 stand rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of Nakano (US 2003/0053008).

Claims 8, 14, and 20 stand rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of Matsuda et al. (US 2002/0167626).

### **Summary of Amendment**

Claims 1, 11, and 18 have been amended. No new matter has been entered. Claims 1-20 are pending for consideration.

### **All Claims Comply With §102 and §103**

Claims 1-4, 6, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, and 19 stand rejected under §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Lee et al. Claims 5, 10, and 17 stand rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of Shiotani et al. Claims 7 and 13 stand rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of Nakano. Claims 8, 14, and 20 stand rejected under §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of Matsuda et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

As amended, independent claims 1 and 18 recite, in part, “an end portion that is in contact

with opposing sides of the reflection sheet to substantially surround and encase the reflection sheet.” Similarly, amended independent claim 11 recites, in part, “an end portion of the bottom cover extends to the outer side of the reflection sheet and is in contact with opposing sides of the reflection sheet to substantially surround and encase the reflection sheet.” Applicant respectfully asserts that Lee et al. fails to teach or suggest at least such a feature. Representative figures 2 and 9 of Lee et al. are reproduced and annotated below for convenience.

FIG. 2





FIG. 9



As shown above, the structure of Lee et al. includes a mold frame (126, 132) inserted between the back cover (128, 138) and the lamp cover 124. Accordingly, Lee et al. fails to teach or suggest at least an end portion that is in contact with opposing sides of the reflection sheet to substantially surround and encase the reflection sheet (i.e., claims 1 and 18) or an end portion of the bottom cover that extends to the outer side of the reflection sheet and is in contact with opposing sides of the reflection sheet to substantially surround and encase the reflection sheet (i.e., claim 11).

Claims 2-4, 6, 9, 12, 15, 16, and 19 depend from the corresponding one of base claims 1,

11, and 18, thereby incorporating all the claim features of the respective one of base claims 1, 11, and 18. Accordingly, dependent claims 2-4, 6, 9, 12, 15, 16, and 19 are allowable over Lee et al. for at least the reasons stated above.

Likewise, claims 5, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 17, and 20 also depend from the corresponding one of base claims 1, 11, and 18, thereby incorporating all the claim features of the respective one of base claims 1, 11, and 18. Moreover, Shiotani et al., Nakano, and Matsuda et al. all fail to cure the deficiencies of Lee et al. described above. Accordingly, Lee et al., Shiotani et al., Nakano, and Matsuda et al., whether taken individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the features of dependent claims 5, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 17, and 20 for at least the reasons explained above.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 and §103 rejections of claims 1-20 be withdrawn.

# # # # #

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By:   
Kyle J. Choi  
Reg. No. 41,480

Dated: February 27, 2007

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
**Customer No.: 009626**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: 202.739.3000  
Facsimile: 202.739.3001